

The Woman's Column.

VOL. XIV.

NEW YORK AND BOSTON, APRIL 20, 1901.

No. 8.

The Woman's Column.

Published Fortnightly at 3 Park Street, Boston, Mass.

EDITOR:

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

Subscription . . . 25 cents per annum.

Advertising Rates . . . 25 cents per line.

Entered as second class matter at the Boston, Mass. Post Office, Jan. 18, 1888.

WOMEN AS CITY TREASURERS.

An interesting feature of the recent elections in Colorado has been the marked tendency of the men to elect women as city treasurers. Women were chosen to this office in eight cities, and in several others they came very near election to the same position, running ahead of their tickets.

Mrs. Margaret Robins was unanimously chosen city treasurer of Idaho Springs. At Aspen, Mrs. E. A. Kenney was reelected to the same office by a large majority. Mrs. Jennie Gale was elected city treasurer at New Castle, Miss Nellie E. Donahue at Victor, Mrs. A. N. Frowine at Manitou, Mrs. Mary Shanks at Ouray, Clara A. Clark at Alma, and Mrs. Emma C. Palmer at Greeley. At the same election women were also chosen treasurers in several of the cities of Kansas. As in almost all these places the men outnumber the women, if women are selected for an office it must be because the men want them to hold it. Perhaps in these days of defaulting bank cashiers and manifold embezzlements, these Western men think this particular office is safest in the hands of the sex that is least given to stock speculation.

Women are also in some demand as city clerks. Several cities in Kansas elected them to that office. In Colorado, Emma J. Talbot was elected clerk of Como and Mrs. E. B. Ruddick of Florence. Mrs. Anderson received 16,728 votes for city clerk of Denver on the Democratic ticket to 23,026 cast for Frank Kratzer, Republican, who was elected.

ONE SOLITARY WOMAN.

A woman has been arrested in Denver on a charge of fraudulent voting. The despatches say it is the first case on record. Women have been voting in Colorado for eight years, in Kansas for fourteen, in Idaho and Utah for five, and in Wyoming for thirty-two. If during all this time only one woman has been charged with fraudulent voting, it is a pretty good record.

A great many men in Denver are charged with having voted fraudulently at the same election; 201 men are under indictment for election frauds in St. Louis alone; while at a recent election in Philadelphia the number of fraudulent votes cast is said to have mounted up into the

thousands. There is hardly a large city in which more or less illegal voting does not go on. This is not regarded by anyone as a proof of the unfitness of all men to vote; but no sooner is one solitary woman charged with illegal voting than the fact is telegraphed from one end of the country to the other, and quoted as a serious reason why all women should be debarred from the ballot-box.

Secretary of the Navy Long says he has never yet heard an argument against woman suffrage that was not an insult to the intelligence of a ten-year-old boy. Certainly this particular objection would come under that head.

WHAT MR. BONYNGE SAYS.

The Tax-Reform League of Denver, which elected most of its candidates at the recent city election, will raise a fund of \$10,000 to prosecute the men who tried to vote illegally, so numerous were these cases of attempted fraud by male voters. The *Denver Republican* is not very friendly to equal suffrage, as it is the organ of ex-Senator Wolcott, whom the women refused to support on account of his notorious morals. The *Republican* publishes an interview with Robert W. Bonyng, one of the few Colorado men who are avowedly and ardently opposed to woman suffrage. He gives a graphic description of two big wagon-loads of male toughs and "hoboes" who started out to vote over and over in as many precincts as they could. Mr. Bonyng says:

They were evidently to be paid according to the number of times they voted. They were driven to Sixteenth and Blake Streets, and made a determined effort to vote. One fellow was taken in, but Mrs. Pollard and Mrs. Cook, our watchers, who did splendid work, challenged him.

Mr. Bonyng is not willing that a woman should take five minutes of time from her family to cast her own vote, but he thinks it "splendid" for women to spend hours at the polls watching out to protect the ballot-box against such men as try to vote illegally. Consistency is a jewel.

A. S. B.

SHE VOTED 300 TIMES.

Miss Kate M. Gordon of New Orleans is probably the only person in the United States who ever voted, legitimately, several hundred times in one day. When the last Louisiana Constitutional Convention gave tax-paying women the right to vote upon all questions submitted to the taxpayers, it added a clause that any woman not wishing to go to the polls in person might give a proxy to a friend to vote for her. Soon after, New Orleans voted on a special tax levy to provide the city with better sewerage and drainage, and the women carried the day for improved sanitation. Miss Gordon was president of the Women's Sewerage and Drainage League.

She got proxies from 300 women who favored better sewerage but dreaded the polls, and she spent the whole day driving about the city and voting; for each proxy vote had to be cast in the precinct where the person who gave the proxy lived. The Business Men's Association of New Orleans gave Miss Gordon a medal for her exertions, and those who saw her at the National Suffrage Convention in Washington the next winter could not perceive that this unprecedented amount of voting had impaired the ladylike grace and repose of her manner. It is no wonder that she now feels amused at the assertion it would destroy women's womanliness to cast one vote a year, or that she took a leading part in the "mock hearing" held lately in New Orleans, where the arguments of the anti-suffragists at the recent legislative hearing in Boston were turned into laughter. The widow of the Chief Justice of Louisiana personated the chairman of the Massachusetts legislative committee, and other prominent New Orleans women represented the suffragists and the remonstrants. A full account of the mock hearing was given in the *Boston Woman's Journal* of April 13.

A QUEEN'S BURIAL.

"Mother Cohen" lived on Bunker Street, which is in the heart of the Russian Jew Ghetto of Chicago. She had seen better days, but not during the many years she lived in this neighborhood, says *Unity*. She lived in a room for which she paid two dollars a month. She earned her living by washing and other odd jobs. But she was eighty-eight years of age. She was taken with pneumonia, and the glass of hot lemonade which a neighbor brought her did not suffice. She died in the ambulance on her way to the county hospital. In her little room there was nothing found but a well-worn Yiddish Bible and one old dress. Before she started she gave her last twenty-five cents to a little child, the last of many pennies that her shrunken hands had placed in the hands of the dreary, weary little children of the neighborhood who had learned to love her. Her death was followed by a public movement among the children of Bunker Street. They massed their pennies, they solicited from door to door. They tried to raise money enough to bury "Mother Cohen" in some other place than the Potter's Field. In this they failed, but they raised money enough to buy her a shroud more elegant than any robe she had worn in life, and the plain pine coffin had flowers on it. One of her little pensioners broke his bank and found \$2.80 in it. He invested it all in violets for "Mother Cohen's" coffin. Chicago has had another "Queen's burial."

Miss Mary Anderson is city attorney of Palmyra, Mo.

"THE ANTI-SUFFRAGIST"

A funny little newspaper has been started in New York by the opponents of equal rights for women. It is called *The Anti-Suffragist*, and is markedly inferior to *The Remonstrance*, the organ of the Massachusetts "antis," in temper, dignity, responsibility, and even accuracy; though in the last particular the Massachusetts paper also is weak.

The *Anti-Suffragist* does not give the name of its editor, and every article in it is anonymous, except one published by an Englishwoman a year ago in the *Nineteenth Century*. But although the writers for the *Anti-Suffragist* are thus careful to hide their identity, there is internal evidence that Mrs. Caroline F. Corbin, Mrs. W. W. Crannell and Mrs. Helen Kendrick Johnson all had a hand in getting it up. Could any other three writers on this question perpetrate so many historical, logical and political blunders in so small a space?

The leading article says: "Woman suffrage received its first impulse in the extravagant teachings of Jean Jacques Rousseau." Rousseau was so far from advocating equal suffrage for women that his ultra utterances in regard to their inferiority and subjection would to-day excite the indignation even of an assembly of "Antis." The article goes on with a tissue of wild historical fallacies, which must be written either by Mrs. Corbin or by a closely kindred spirit.

The next article is called "The Passing of Woman Suffrage in Australia," meaning its passing off the stage, not its passing on to victory. The anonymous author, who writes much in the style of Mrs. Johnson, refuses in the teeth of evidence to believe that last year West Australia followed the example of South Australia and gave full Parliamentary suffrage to women. She says of West Australia: "In 1899 both houses passed a resolution favoring woman suffrage, but it has not been submitted to the people;" and she refers to South Australia as "the one colony where woman suffrage prevails." But the last number of the Australian paper *Woman's Sphere* says:

WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

The Federal campaign is in full swing in the golden West, and candidates are making eloquent appeals to the women voters. Although opposed—some of them—to women's suffrage, they don't hesitate to ask them for their votes, and the election manifestoes of all begin with "Ladies and gentlemen."

In West Australia, since the foregoing was published, the women have actually cast their first Parliamentary votes; but this "Anti" still shuts her eyes and denies the fact.

Perhaps the most amazing flight of fancy in this highly inaccurate little sheet is the following, which occurs in the third anonymous article:

The suffragists, more than two years ago, in national convention assembled, voted that ever thereafter they should be distinguished by three things, namely: They would not use the husband's name, they would remove their hats in places where men remove theirs, and they would have plenty of pockets in their gowns and jackets.

The present writer has been recording

secretary of the national body for many years, and it is hardly necessary to say that her minutes contain the record of no such vote.

The superiority of *The Remonstrance* to *The Anti-Suffragist* is probably to be accounted for by the fact that here in Massachusetts we have had an anti-suffrage movement for more than a quarter of a century, while in New York it is comparatively new. In the beginning *The Remonstrance* was as carefully and completely anonymous as the New York paper now is, but in 1892 it began to publish the names of the persons responsible for it, and now it always prints the officers of the Association at the head of the first page. Probably with time *The Anti-Suffragist* will grow in dignity, if not in wisdom. At present it is puerile.

It is published at 122 E. 23d St., New York City. Let those of our readers who want to be amused send for copies.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

MRS. HOWE ON SUFFRAGE.

Mrs. Julia Ward Howe, at a meeting of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association held several years ago, spoke words so pertinent to some objections lately urged afresh against equal rights that we reprint her address. Mrs. Howe said:

I am glad to attend with you a festival of common sense and of common right. It is pleasant to meet with friends, and to look round upon familiar faces. But it is more than pleasant, it is happy, to be one of an assemblage drawn together by sympathy, not only for each other, but for humanity. We often think of the great humanitarian work as withdrawn from common life, isolated on the heights of solitary meditation and grandeur. But these high dreams find their realization in occasions like the present, in which are touched true master chords of feeling and of conscience; and the earnest, heroic intention of serving and bettering the world takes on a tangible form and purpose.

It is true that the interest which brings us together here separates us in some measure from many whose opinions do not agree with our own. The vein of reform sometimes crosses the vein of fashion, but it rarely runs parallel with it. As friends not only of truth, but of free thought, we ought to welcome the honest marshalling of those whose wishes are against our prayers. Better far this animated examination of a subject than the slavish acceptance even of a true doctrine. Where the mind asks to be convinced, it is useful for us to review and restate the grounds of our own persuasion. Honest doubts and difficulties are often removed in this way. But where we meet ignorance in its panoply of self-content, the passion of those who are indifferent to right, and who hate a thing because it is not theirs, we must push our way, inch by inch, step by step. Such opposition always in the end gives way, as darkness before light, as inertia yields to dynamic force. Knowing this, we can both hold our ground and maintain our advance.

As the Friends have a way of measuring what they call the solid sense of a

meeting, so we, I think, may say that the weight of sound thought and active conscience in the world is decidedly with us to-day. We see this in the good literature which advocates our cause. We see it in the noble names appended to our petitions, both here and in Europe. And I must say that we often see it in the frivolous and empty arguments which are brought against our demand.

I am willing to let bygones be bygones, but I cannot forget occasions at the State House on which, as Mr. Garrison once said: "Intelligence and culture have asked for suffrage, and ignorance and vulgarity have petitioned against it." That was before the spirit of opposition was fully aroused. Later on, a party of remonstrants made its muster beneath that gilded dome. It uttered its protest against our cause. And when we, who had allowed our opponents every courtesy in the way of reply and objection, asked leave to question a single statement, we were refused the manifest right. Were our adversaries so weak in faith and conviction that they feared to allow us to be heard for one moment? Yes; I think they were.

I think I will ask here the question which I was not allowed to ask at the remonstrants' hearing. Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells having concluded her address by the assertion that women ought never to have the suffrage until every woman should be perfectly pure, perfectly wise, and perfectly good, I did wish to bring to mind an ancient proverb, and to ask whether what was sauce for the goose could properly be served up as sauce for the gander?

These meetings show, among other things, the character of those who believe in suffrage with their whole heart. We who are gathered here are not a frantic, shrieking mob. We are not contemners of marriage, nor neglectors of home and offspring. We are individually allowed to be men and women of sound intellect, of reputable life, having the same stake and interest in the well-being of the community that others have. Most of us are persons of moderate competence, earned or inherited, and of more value to the community than we should be if we were able to chase the bubble of vain amusement around the globe whenever the fancy should seize us. We have had, or hope to have, our holy fireside, our joyful cradle, our decent bank account. Why should any consider us as the enemies of society, we who have everything to gain by its good government?

I remember a time when a woman suffrage meeting advertised to be held in New York was looked upon by the public with disfavor. The advocates of the measure were then commonly represented as a group of those shrieking, howling fanatics whom I have just mentioned. If I heard of the meeting at that time, I certainly shared the general impression. Had I gone into that meeting, what should I have seen there? The matronly majesty of Lucretia Mott, the saintly form of William Henry Channing, the maidenly bloom and modesty of Lucy Stone. And who were the shriekers and howlers at that meeting? They were the mob who would not suffer these apostles to speak.

I was present at Faneuil Hall one Sunday evening, with many others, to hear a man whose pious eloquence is the boast and delight of much of the wealth and fashion of Boston. On this occasion, his intention was to address the working people of this city, who came in great numbers to the hall, and who listened to him with profound attention. One of them, on the way thither, was heard to thank God that for once Phillips Brooks could be heard without broadcloth. When I reflect that this man, who is broad enough in heart and sympathy to grasp in his hands the opposite poles of wealth and of poverty, and to unite them by his word and presence, has signed our woman suffrage petition, I seem to see that Christian charity is like the perfect arch of the rainbow, touching vast distances, and uniting them, without lapse or omission, at the highest point of vision.

The different stages through which a positive reform must pass have been characterized as those of indifference, ridicule, and acceptance. To my mind, another statement is possible. A reform which implies a revolution is first seen to be just. It is then seen to be possible. Last of all, it is seen to be providential. Now, the claim of woman to an equal opportunity with man was seen to be just when Plato, the greatest of philosophers, so stated it in terms which the subtlest of his hearers could not gainsay. It was so seen when Paul said that in the Christian dispensation there is neither male nor female. It was seen when Mary Woolstoncraft published her daring thesis, and later, when the strong-souled men and women who arose to help the slave made their banner broad and bright with the motto, "Equal rights for all." It was seen to be possible when we, of this country, had learned the lesson of the great triumph of conscience which was taught us in our own war. Slavery was then seen to be a weaker relic of barbarism, and freedom to be the destiny of the human race. And now we see that it is providential, because it fits in with all the social and moral ameliorations which are establishing themselves in the order of the civilized world.

I once heard a speaker remark that the world was becoming daily more and more feminine. The masculine dispensation of force and violence, he said, was gradually giving way before that power of gentleness, affection, and charity, which is thought to be essentially feminine. The predominance of this side of human nature has been seen in history to be fatal to despotisms of all kinds. Christianity undermined the Roman Empire. In the church itself, charity is the victorious opponent of violence and prejudice. In Christ's name, men can no longer burn or torture their fellows. As the conquering harmony pervades them, Christians have no choice but to kiss and agree in their spirit, however they may differ as to the letter of belief.

We see its effect in education. Women are no longer taught to adore force in all its manifestations, and to abdicate before it all the fine and tender impulses of their nature. The "more excellent way" is shown to all men and to all women, the crowning of that holy virtue which be-

lieveth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Military empire will die away. It is the house built upon the sand. The whirlwinds of passion, the tides of interest undermine, and presently sweep it away. But the empire of moral sentiments is the house founded upon a rock. It is the New Jerusalem coming down from heaven to enthrone itself steadfastly upon earth. And generation after generation shall pass away, thoughts, fashions, desires shall change; but this, the true temple of humanity, shall be constantly reëdified out of a grander state than Egypt, Greece, or Rome—the commonwealth of the nations, God's kingdom upon earth.

THE NEXT FORTNIGHTLY.

At the next Fortnightly, to be held at 3 Park Street, April 23, at 3 P. M., Mr. Herbert D. Ward will speak on "Vivisection." Mrs. Elizabeth Stuart Phelps Ward will be present, and will speak if able. Mrs. Livermore will preside. Light refreshments will be served, as usual. Admission free to members; to others, 15 cents.

NEW ENGLAND CLUB CONFERENCE.

The Conference of the Women's Clubs of New England opened in Symphony Hall, Boston, on the evening of April 11, with a large and brilliant audience. About five hundred delegates were present from all over New England, and about fifteen hundred from Massachusetts.

A full report is given in the *Woman's Journal* of April 20. The color question was discussed, but no action was taken as to the withdrawal of the New England clubs. The *Woman's Journal* says:

"The proposal that the women's clubs of New England should withdraw from the General Federation is the most unwise plan that could be suggested, and the most likely to delay indefinitely a just solution of the color-line question in the General Federation. The vast majority of the women's clubs are in the North and West, and most of the Northern and Western clubs are opposed to drawing the color line. The Southern women's clubs, while strong in ability, are few in numbers. In this as in every other question on which there is a fundamental difference of opinion, the final decision must accord with the views of the majority. The advocates of the color line know themselves to be in the minority, and all their efforts thus far have been to stave off discussion in the General Federation and to keep the matter from coming to a vote. These tactics succeeded at Milwaukee, but they cannot succeed forever. Sooner or later the question will be brought to a vote, and will be decided by the majority of the delegates present and voting upon it. While this decision is pending, for the strongest opponents of the color line to withdraw and thus disfranchise themselves would be a most short-sighted policy.

"The excellent women who advocate withdrawal are moved partly by the wish to make the most emphatic protest possible against the color line, partly by dis-

satisfaction with the choice of Los Angeles as the place for the next biennial, and by the belief that New England and the Middle West cannot take to distant Southern California delegations large enough to carry their point. If so, it will be regrettable; but the policy of holding the biennial out of reach of New England and the Middle West cannot be pursued forever. Sooner or later a biennial must be held in a place where the majority of the women's clubs can bring their will to bear, and whenever that happens it will be the end of the color line. It is likely that this color question is destined to split the General Federation; but if anything so unfortunate as a split must come, let it come by the withdrawal of the minority whose opinions are out of harmony with those of the majority, not by the withdrawal of the most impetuous section of the majority, who can have things their own way if they will wait and hold together."

GOOSE AND GANDER.

Sour-minded cynics who declare that women have a faculty for creating discord will say, "I told you so," on learning that the dean and entire faculty of the school of pedagogy of the New York University have resigned because a woman's committee composed of Miss Helen Gould and others has criticised some of their methods. — *Boston Herald*.

If all the faculty of Wellesley College were to resign because an advisory committee of men criticized some of their methods, it would certainly be quoted as an illustration of the oversensitiveness of women. — *Woman's Journal*.

PUBLIC SPIRIT OF CLUB WOMEN.

It was refreshing and stimulating during the proceedings of that cultured and æsthetic gathering of the New England Women's Clubs this week, to note the irrepressible undercurrent of purposeful and practical impulse. The subjects chosen for the conference were significant of its growing tendency not only to add to its culture, but also to apply that culture with spirit and enterprise to existing problems. It is interesting to observe how soon, too, in the endeavor to apply their abilities to the help of social and municipal conditions, women confront the fact that they are tremendously handicapped because of the lack of that essential leverage, the power to act directly in the appointment of officials and the enactment of laws. No doubt the press and literary production and distribution—the lines of work to which women are relegated—are very good. But intelligent women soon are made aware that to win respect for their opinions they need the weight and dignity of a complete citizenship. Looking over the cultured, serious-minded and refined assembly, the interested observer could only wonder how much longer this investment would be withheld which, like the touch of the trolley to the wire, would speed this thoroughly-equipped body on its earnest and thoughtful purpose to promote a purer public spirit, a finer public life and a more robust patriotism. — *Boston Transcript*.

MR. FINCK ON WOMAN'S SPHERE.

Valued friends in different parts of the country have written urging us to review two articles against equal rights for women by Henry T. Finck, which have lately appeared in the N. Y. *Independent*. It is not worth while to waste powder and shot on these essays.

The first, which appeared under the preposterous title "Are Womanly Women Doomed?" was a diatribe against almost all the enlarged opportunities that have been opened to women within the last fifty years, and especially against the movement for equal suffrage. Articles so ultra and rabid as this do little harm, and considerable good. Their tone is so extremely reactionary that it stirs up all the latent equal rights sentiment in people who never before suspected that they possessed any, and irritates to white heat all those who were already believers. When a wild and wonderful "anti" tirade of this sort appears, experienced suffragists laugh in their sleeves. We know that the enemy is playing our game more effectively than we could do it ourselves. The only wonder is that the *Independent* should have printed such an article.

Mr. Finck's second article, "Employments Unsuitable for Women," is more moderate in its tone. It looks as if the tempest of dissent and ridicule called out by the first article had led the author to draw in his horns a little. There is some sense in his second essay, but it is mixed up with so much antiquated nonsense that it will fail to get a hearing from the kind of young women whom he wishes to influence. Many women would undoubtedly be better in health and richer in pocket if they would do housework instead of factory work; but how many American girls will be persuaded to exchange the factory for the kitchen by Mr. Finck's amazing insinuation that almost all the women who work in factories become unchaste? He seems not to be aware that more of the girls in rescue homes and maternity hospitals come from domestic service than from any other one occupation. If employments that "endanger chastity" should be "promptly suppressed," domestic service must be suppressed first of all.

Mr. Finck also holds that "all employments which make women muscular will be more and more rigidly tabooed as unwomanly." Then no woman will be allowed to churn butter or bend over the washtub. Women should "remain at home and cultivate the graces and refined allurements of femininity," but if forced by necessity to labor, they "have all the opportunities for earning a living they need in a hundred branches of work that require no muscular toil." Benighted Mr. Finck! Does he really imagine that a woman who stays at home and does her own housework performs "no muscular toil"?

Mr. Finck's protests will have no more influence on the course of events than the barking of a small dog by the roadside has on a Fourth of July procession. The procession marches on, and the clamorous objections of the little dog are soon forgotten. All through his essay he neglects the sage advice once given by an old news-

paper man to a young one. The latter had written an article headed "Shall Women Study Greek?" "Unless you want to get into trouble," said the man of experience, "you would better change that title to 'Will Women Study Greek?'" The element of "shall" is unduly strong in Mr. Finck's whole treatment of this subject.

ALICE STONE BLACKWELL.

STATE REGULATION OF VICE.

The European system of State regulation of vice has now been introduced in Hawaii, not by the United States, but by the Hawaiian government. A vigorous protest will undoubtedly be made by the better element there. Fresh evidence as to the same evil system maintained by the U. S. Army authorities in the Philippines has lately been published by the Chicago *New Voice*. Meanwhile "regulation" has been seriously shaken in Japan, hitherto one of its strongholds. Verily the heathen put us to shame—especially the Japanese.

The following particulars appear in *All the World*, the monthly periodical of the Salvation Army:

"Three months ago, we commenced Rescue Work among the women of Japan, making a determined attack upon the chief brothel quarter of the city of Tokio. The result has been the creation of an agitation that has stirred the nation, and brought about a change of the laws affecting licensed prostitution.

"A special Rescue *War Cry* was issued. We had also open-air meetings in the brothel quarter, and in response to the piteous appeals for help from a number of girls, we took steps to obtain their release. As a result, however, a number of our officers and soldiers were attacked and rather badly injured, including the Chief Secretary (Major Duce) and our *War-Cry* editor. The newspapers published long and detailed accounts of these attacks upon us, creating quite a sensation. The whole Japanese press took the matter up, and several of the leading newspapers secured by force the release of two or three girls. It soon became the chief topic throughout the country, and such a spontaneous outburst of public feeling was aroused that the Government issued a new law, under which any girl may now leave a brothel whenever she chooses, and making it a penal offence for anyone to attempt to hinder her. The fact that the action of the Salvationists first drew public attention to the iniquitous practices alluded to, has drawn out the sympathy of the whole nation toward our work—except, of course, the keepers of the brothels, who have lost millions of yen over the business. Hundreds of girls are leaving and going back to their friends, some of the largest houses have been closed, and a traffic which three months ago was considered one of the most prosperous in the kingdom, is now in a tottering condition. It is not surprising that those interested were furious. They attacked a newspaper office in Tokio, and threatened both us and our building.

"It has been a busy season for us. For a time our headquarters was literally besieged by friends seeking advice and help

to secure the release of girls anxious to leave their evil life. We have assisted a large number, several of whom are in a Home opened for the purpose, and others have been restored to their friends."

INDIFFERENCE TO SUFFRAGE.

Devices to overcome the "apathy" of the male voter are multiplying on every side. In Chicago the Republican political managers are disgusted to find that 37 per cent. of the registered Republicans neglected to vote at the recent exciting city election. As they have the framing of the jury lists, they propose to place the names of these Republican non-voters first on the list, so that they may have the first chance to be drawn for jury duty. As jury service is unwelcome to the average citizen, it is hoped that this punishment may lead the delinquents to vote next time, as the lesser evil. Meanwhile Mississippi Democrats are proposing to make white Democrats who fail to qualify as voters ineligible to jury service, hoping that the disgrace will induce them to vote.

Apparently the same indifference to the right of suffrage exists abroad. Mr. Gamaliel Bradford, a prominent opponent of equal rights for women, in a letter to the Boston *Herald* calls attention to the small vote of men in the election of the London County Council. The small vote of women in that election was made an argument against equal suffrage, but of course Mr. Bradford draws no such inference from the indifference of men. The total number of men and women on the register in London in 1901, it seems, was 757,389, of whom at the county council election this year only 248,321 voted—35 per cent. But in the national election of 1900, there were 421,910 votes cast; nearly twice as many as at the county council election, although at the national election the women could not vote. Mr. Bradford quotes the London *Times* as saying:

"Toward the end of each triennial period there is a little spurt of excitement; people go about saying that the growth of the rates is becoming serious, parade the figures of the debt which the council is piling up, and conclude that something must really be done to get members elected who will practise economy. There is lamentation about the apathy of the electors, and helpless amazement at the difference of their behavior upon imperial and municipal issues. Then there are exhortations to all and sundry to shake off their lethargy and vindicate the common sense and prudence of the people of London. Nothing comes of it all, nor can we imagine that anything can come of it. Apathy is not dispelled by telling people to be interested, but by giving them something that interests them."

Commenting on this, Mr. Bradford says: "How familiar all this sounds! Talk with a man you meet upon the political situation in this country. Does it not always end the same way?" Yet Mr. Bradford, Mr. G. W. Anderson and others insist that the number of women who vote for school committee is a fair indication of the number who would vote for President of the United States.

The New York M. E. Conference has made quite a spectacle of itself this week.